# Principal Moderator Report

# Summer 2010

Applied GCE

Information and Communication Technology (6955)

Paper 01 Web Development

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/

Alternatively, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated ICT telephone line: 0844 372 2186

# General Comments

This was the first time the work was assessed on the updated version of the specification.

The entry for this unit is relatively small. Moderated marks of 9-52 were given which supported eportfolios across the range being submitted. Some candidates accessed marks in the 50s with a good number in the 40s. Overall assessment was realistic for the majority of centres. However, there were weaknesses in some centres which suggested that previous moderator reports to the centre and also the Principal Moderator's reports for this unit had not been taken into account.

One major aspect affecting candidate performance is the use of a client. Few candidates produced convincing evidence that liaison with a client had been undertaken to produce the evidence for this unit. There was also evidence that many of the eportfolios had been created using heavily structured assignments, some of which had been used for a number of years and had not been adapted. Some of these assignments did not match the assessment grid properly and did not address the revised specification.

The use of a client is essential in order to access the marks in the higher mark bands. Section 5.1 of the unit specification gives further clarification. Someone appropriate can role play the part of a client. Too often, there is a weak reference to "my client" and this is insufficient to access the higher mark bands.

There is still evidence that Assessors are awarding marks across all strands based on the standard of the website produced and not the requirements of each individual strand. Each strand should be assessed on its merits using the grid in the specification.

There is still a lack of understanding of difference between design, implementation and prototyping and what evidence is appropriate for strands b and c.

Candidates supplied the websites created which is correct practice. There was evidence relating to all strands, however the processes behind the production of the website were poorly evidenced.


## QWC

This was assessed for the first time under the updated specification. The majority of centres commented on QWC on the e-sheet and used the criteria correctly, however some misunderstanding was evident in a few cases.

The rules for QWC are as follows:

- The content of the work is marked, identifying the band and the mark that the work is worth.

- The QWC is assessed and the mark is then adjusted, within the band, to give a final mark.

- The content mark cannot be increased on the basis of QWC.

- If the content mark awarded is at the bottom of a band, the candidate's mark cannot be reduced further.

- QWC should not be assessed elsewhere in the unit.

**Centre Administration**

Candidates need to supply explicit evidence to support their achievement of the criteria in the various marking grids. It is easier to confirm marks if the evidence is easy to find and supplied in an explicit form. Assessors must use the e-sheets as an opportunity to explain why they have awarded marks, there are two advantages to this for the centre. If the moderator can see why and where marks are awarded it is easier to agree with the centre marks, secondly if the centre marks cannot be agreed then the moderator can give better guidance to help future assessment.

Some of the esheets were not named correctly. The correct file naming conventions is specified in the Guidance for Centres: Moderation of ePortfolios document which can be found on the Applied GCE ICT section of Edexcel.com.

A number of centres still do not meet deadlines for submitting work to the moderators. The deadlines are published in advance and must be adhered to unless special permission has been obtained in advance from Edexcel. Permission will only be granted in exceptional circumstances. Centres who miss the deadline risk having the results delayed or the candidates recorded as absent. Each unit must be on a separate CD, even if sent to the same moderator.

# Strand A

Overall this is being assessed more accurately. Many candidates are using project management software which is best practice. Other candidates used spreadsheet software which is acceptable for this AS unit. Those candidates producing Word tables and DiDA type action plans were not able to access the marks in this strand.

Few candidates addressed the strand well enough to provide evidence to address the higher mark bands and most produced a poor Gantt chart with no real evidence that it had been used to help the process of design and implementation of the website.

Some of the plans did not appear to have been produced at the start of the process. Many did not have realistic timescales or include the aspects listed in 5.2 of the unit specification. Most included the evaluation and proposal, which is not required, but then neglected to state the date the website would be handed over to the client.

The best evidence is updating the plan and including the different versions in the eportfolio complete with annotation explaining updates. Project logs/diaries and minutes of meetings with the client can all support the use of the plan."

# Strand B

Most candidates did produce some evidence to support both main aspects of this strand, ie the Investigation into the client needs and the Design. However, most of the evidence was poor and generously assessed. There was obvious confusion as to

what is design, strand b and what is prototyping which is part of strand c.  The lack of a client impacts on the marks for this strand. Candidates did not seem to know the difference between prototyping and implementation.

Many candidates had work placed at the top of mark band 2 or in mark band 3 although there was very limited evidence of the client needs and often this was not drawn together well in a Requirements Analysis. There should be a variety of techniques used if the candidate is to move into mark band 2.

Very often there was a blank questionnaire, no real profile of the client or there was a few details under headings which appeared to be part of the assignment brief. Some candidates analysed competitive websites which was useful but others looked at irrelevant websites or hadn't defined the client so it was not clear if the evidence was useful or not.

There was evidence of headings being used and candidates writing a brief sentence underneath which does not demonstrate progression to an AS unit and does not address the requirements of mark band 2. Candidates who had addressed this section well often presented the evidence in the form of a report addressed to the client.

Designs were often poorly drawn scanned in images which did not address 5.4 well. Some candidates had screen shots of the final website which is not correct. The designs should be well presented and reflect the research carried out to establish the client needs. A good range of features should be included and detailed.

The structure diagram was usually produced to a satisfactory standard.  The flow charts are still poor and often taken from unit 2 rather than showing the main user pathways through the site.

## Strand C

Most of the marks were allocated to the website produced and there were instances where that was the only evidence produced for this strand. In fact there are 3 distinct areas, the prototyping of the design, the actual website and testing.

The prototyping was very poorly evidenced with few candidates including convincing evidence that proper prototyping had been undertaken. Good prototyping is a form of formative testing and addresses aspects of 5.1. To access all the marks in mark band 1, there should be evidence of some prototyping to improve and refine the initial design. Too often this consisted of cosmetic changes, ie colour, and weak reference to "my client". Stronger candidates had clear evidence of meetings with the client with explanations of changes required, with before and after screen shots. To access the higher mark bands there needs to be evidence of user feedback which, ideally, is the target audience. There was little evidence of screenshots showing the changes made.  Before and after screen shots would do this.

The standard of websites produced varied in quality. It was good to see the majority of candidates included the websites in their eportfolios. The final website should be clearly marked and functional (fully functional for mark band 3). Some evidence had been placed in mark band 3 although a very limited range of software skills was demonstrated – 5.8 of the unit specification has a suggested list. Although there were some excellent websites produced, there were also a good number of very poor examples that did not reflect the progression expected of candidates on an AS course undertaking a Web Development unit.

It was good to see that some of the better eportfolios had evidenced 5.5 well which is part of the requirements of mark band 3.

Those candidates who had provided evidence that they had prototyped the design often also included evidence of prototyping of a working model through to final model, clearly utilising comments from the client and/or target audience. This evidenced formative testing well. More candidates produced evidence of summative testing and some of this was well done and addressed most of 5.6. The weaker candidates seemed to concentrate on buttons and links which really only supports the limited testing required for mark band 1.

Some websites demonstrated little adherence to standard ways of working. The quality assurance of the content was not always undertaken with uncorrected errors, pictures not displaying etc. Few candidates evidenced legislation and codes of practice with the acknowledgement of sources and respect of copyright. Most candidates had a link to the finished website from the eportfolio but some had not included this and folders and files had to be examined in order to find the right html file to access the website.

## Strand D

The evidence for this strand is improving and the assessment reasonably accurate. There is still a tendency for candidates to write a narrative of what they had done rather than evaluate the performance (does it work) and functionality (does it do what the client wanted) of the website created. Very often feedback was listed but no reference made to this in the evaluative comments although, often, marks in mark band 2 had been awarded. Still some candidates are evaluating their own performance and, sometimes, the eportfolio, which are not requirements of this strand.

## Strand E

It was good to see many more candidates presenting the evidence correctly, ie a Proposal addressed to the client in an appropriate format. The best evidence was in the form of a professionally presented report. Overall this strand was much better addressed with some sensible recommendations. However, some candidates recommended an enhancement for functionality from the list for 5.7 but chose something that was not relevant to the client's needs and website created, eg an ecommerce site for a client who has nothing to sell.

# Unit Results

| Grade | Maximum Mark | A | B | C | D | E | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Boundary Mark | 60 | 46 | 40 | 34 | 28 | 23 | 18 |
| Max Uniform Mark | 100 | 80 | 70 | 60 | 50 | 40 | 0-39 |

Candidates who do not achieve the standard required for a grade E will receive a uniform mark in the range of 0-39.

**Note**
Grade boundaries may vary from year to year and from subject to subject.

# Qualification Results

## Advanced Subsidary (Single Award)

The minimum uniform marks required for each grade:

| Qualification Grade | A | B | C | D | E |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Maximum Uniform Mark = 300 | 240 | 210 | 180 | 150 | 120 |

Candidates who do not achieve the standard required for a grade E will receive a uniform mark in the range of 0-119.

## Advanced GCE (Single Award)

The minimum uniform marks required for each grade:

| Qualification Grade | A | B | C | D | E |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Maximum Uniform Mark = 600 | 480 | 420 | 360 | 300 | 240 |

Candidates who do not achieve the standard required for a grade E will receive a uniform mark in the range of 0-239.

## Advanced Subsidary (Double Award)

The minimum uniform marks required for each grade:

| Qualification Grade | AA | AB | BB | BC | CC | CD | DD | DE | EE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Maximum Uniform Mark = 600 | 480 | 450 | 420 | 390 | 360 | 330 | 300 | 270 | 240 |

Candidates who do not achieve the standard required for a grade EE will receive a uniform mark in the range of 0-239.

## Advanced GCE with Advanced Subsidary (Additional)

The minimum uniform marks required for each grade:

| Qualification Grade | AA | AB | BB | BC | CC | CD | DD | DE | EE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Maximum Uniform Mark = 900 | 720 | 690 | 630 | 600 | 540 | 510 | 450 | 420 | 360 |

Candidates who do not achieve the standard required for a grade EE will receive a uniform mark in the range of 0-359.

## Advanced GCE (Double Award)

The minimum uniform marks required for each grade:

| Qualification Grade | AA | AB | BB | BC | CC | CD | DD | DE | EE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Maximum Uniform Mark = 1200 | 960 | 900 | 840 | 780 | 720 | 660 | 600 | 540 | 480 |

Candidates who do not achieve the standard required for a grade EE will receive a uniform mark in the range of 0-479